UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,769	06/23/2006	Roman Levenshteyn	P18511-US1	1296

27045   7590   11/17/2008

ERICSSON INC.
6300 LEGACY DRIVE
M/S EVR 1-C-11
PLANO, TX 75024

EXAMINER
SURYAWANSI, SUDHISH K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
4171	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/17/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06/23/06*.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on *6/23/2006* is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:

        1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date *6/23/2006*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Page 3 of applicant's Oath/Declaration claims a foreign priority. However, no

certified copy has been found on the record.

2.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
> matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
> conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 13-18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is

directed to non-statutory subject matter. As to claims 13-18 are directed to a computer

program loadable into a policy decision device. Therefore, the claims 13-18 are

directed to program per se, therefore, non-statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public
> use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United
> States.

Claims 1-18, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cline et al

(US 5,313,616).

As to claim 1, Cline discloses a method for taking a policy decision (see

analyzing and verifying in column 11 lines 22-24, figure 7) by a policy decision device

(SBV program, see in column 11 lines 22-24, figure 7), wherein the policy decision

device (SBV program, see in column 11 lines 22-24, figure 7) has access to objects

(see the object code of an application in figure 2 [18, column 6 lines 15-21) being

relatable to each other by relations (see the set of system compatibility rules including

BSC and OCS in column 4 lines 36-42, figure 1 [10]) of one or more relation types (see

system and library calls in column 11 lines 23), the method comprising the steps of

receiving a request (see basic blocks in figure 7 [38]) for the policy decision (see

analyzing and verifying in column 11 lines 22-24, figure 7), the request (see basic

blocks in figure 7 [38]) specifying a first object (see the object code of an application in

figure 2 [18, column 6 lines 15-21) of the and request information (see basic blocks in

figure 7 [38]), obtaining a policy (see a set of rules analyze the call based on the format

of the application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5) matching to the request

information (see basic blocks in figure 7 [38]) and being applicable to a second object

(see the object code of an application in figure 2 [18, column 6 lines 15-21) of the

objects (see the object code of an application in figure 2 [18, column 6 lines 15-21),

obtaining at least one propagation rule (see a set of rules analyze the call based on the

format of the application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5) associated to the

policy (see a set of rules analyze the call based on the format of the application being

analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5), the at least one propagation rule (see a set of

rules analyze the call based on the format of the application being analyzed; column 9

lines 4-11, figure 5) specifying at least one relation type (see system and library calls in

column 11 lines 23) of the one or more relation types (see system and library calls in

column 11 lines 23), verifying (see analyzing and verifying in column 11 lines 22-24,

figure 7) if a relation path (see a unique path in column 14 lines 9-10) exits, the relation

path (see a unique path in column 14 lines 9-10) linking the first object (see the object

code (see the object code of an application in figure 2 [18, column 6 lines 15-21) of an

application in figure 2 [18, column 6 lines 15-21) and the second object (see the object

code of an application in figure 2 [18, column 6 lines 15-21) and consisting of one or

more of the relations (see the set of system compatibility rules including BSC and OCS

in column 4 lines 36-42, figure 1 [10]), verifying (see analyzing and verifying in column

11 lines 22-24, figure 7) if the one or more relations (see the set of system compatibility

rules including BSC and OCS in column 4 lines 36-42, figure 1 [10]) of the relation path

(see a unique path in column 14 lines 9-10) are in accordance with at least one of the at

least one specified relation type (see system and library calls in column 11 lines 23),

and if said relation path (see a unique path in column 14 lines 9-10) exists and if said

one or more relations (see the set of system compatibility rules including BSC and OCS

in column 4 lines 36-42, figure 1 [10]) of the relation path (see a unique path in column

14 lines 9-10) are in accordance, applying the policy (see a set of rules analyze the call

based on the format of the application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5) to

the first object (see the object code of an application in figure 2 [18, column 6 lines 15-

21) for taking the policy decision (see analyzing and verifying in column 11 lines 22-24,

figure 7).

As to claim 2, Cline teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein the at least one propagation rule (see a set of rules analyze the call based on the format of the application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5) specifies at least one direction (see procedure calls in column 9 lines 15-19) and the method further comprises the step of verifying (see analyzing and verifying in column 11 lines 22-24, figure 7) if the one or more relations (see the set of system compatibility rules including BSC and OCS in column 4 lines 36-42, figure 1 [10]) of the relation path (see a unique path in column 14 lines 9-10) are in accordance with the at least one specified direction(see procedure calls in column 9 lines 15-19) .

As to claim 3, Cline teaches The method according to claim 1, wherein the at least one propagation rule (see a set of rules analyze the call based on the format of the application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5) specifies at least one condition that is verified (see analyzing and verifying in column 11 lines 22-24, figure 7) for at least one of the objects (see the object code of an application in figure 2 [18, column 6 lines 15-21) of the relation (see a unique path in column 14 lines 9-10).

As to claim 4, Cline teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein the existence of the relation path (see a unique path in column 14 lines 9-10) is considered for obtaining of the policy (see a set of rules analyze the call based on the format of the application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5).

As to claim 5, Cline teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein the at least one propagation rule (see a set of rules analyze the call based on the format of the application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5) is obtained from at least one propagation rule database (see a set of rules analyze the call based on the format of the application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5) on the basis of at least one reference identifier (see "open addressing" hash table in column 9 lines 15-19) associated to the at least one propagation rule (see a set of rules analyze the call based on the format of the application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5) and the policy (see a set of rules analyze the call based on the format of the application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5).

As to claim 6, Cline teaches The method according to claim 1, wherein at least one further policy component (see a set of rules analyze the call based on the format of the application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5) of the policy (see a set of rules analyze the call based on the format of the application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5) is obtained from at least one policy component database (see a set of rules analyze the call based on the format of the application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5) based on at least one reference identifier (see "open addressing" hash table in column 9 lines 15-19) associated to the at least one further policy (see a set of rules analyze the call based on the format of the application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5) component and the policy (see a set of rules analyze the call based on the format of the application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure

5).

As to claim 7, Cline teaches A policy decision device (SBV program, see in

column 11 lines 22-24, figure 7) for taking a policy decision (see analyzing and verifying

in column 11 lines 22-24, figure 7), the policy decision device (SBV program, see in

column 11 lines 22-24, figure 7) comprising: a receiving unit (see the object reader

OMODMGR.C in column 10 lines 42- 43) and a processing unit (see the block analyzer

PROCBLK.C in column 10 lines 66-68, column 11 lines 1-2) wherein the processing unit

(see the block analyzer PROCBLK.C in column 10 lines 66-68, column 11 lines 1-2) is

adapted to access objects (see the object code of an application in figure 2 [18, column

6 lines 15-21) being relatable to each other by relations (see the set of system

compatibility rules including BSC and OCS in column 4 lines 36-42, figure 1 [10]) of one

or more relation types (see system and library calls in column 11 lines 23), the receiving

unit (see the object reader OMODMGR.C in column 10 lines 42- 43) is adapted to

receive a request (see basic blocks in figure 7 [38]) for the policy decision (see

analyzing and verifying in column 11 lines 22-24, figure 7), the request (see basic

blocks in figure 7 [38]) specifying a first object (see the object code of an application in

figure 2 [18, column 6 lines 15-21) of the objects (see the object code of an application

in figure 2 [18, column 6 lines 15-21) and request (see basic blocks in figure 7 [38])

information, the processing unit (see the block analyzer PROCBLK.C in column 10 lines

66-68, column 11 lines 1-2) is further adapted to obtain a policy (see a set of rules

analyze the call based on the format of the application being analyzed; column 9 lines

4-11, figure 5) matching to the request (see basic blocks in figure 7 [38]) information

and being applicable to a second object (see the object code of an application in figure

2 [18, column 6 lines 15-21) of the objects (see the object code of an application in

figure 2 [18, column 6 lines 15-21), to obtain at least one propagation rule (see a set of

rules analyze the call based on the format of the application being analyzed; column 9

lines 4-11, figure 5) associated to the policy (see a set of rules analyze the call based

on the format of the application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5), the at

least one propagation rule (see a set of rules analyze the call based on the format of the

application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5) specifying at least one relation

type (see system and library calls in column 11 lines 23) of the one or more relation

types (see system and library calls in column 11 lines 23), to verify if a relation path (see

a unique path in column 14 lines 9-10) exits, the relation path (see a unique path in

column 14 lines 9-10) linking the first object (see the object code of an application in

figure 2 [18, column 6 lines 15-21) and the second object (see the object code of an

application in figure 2 [18, column 6 lines 15-21) and consisting of one or more of the

relations (see the set of system compatibility rules including BSC and OCS in column 4

lines 36-42, figure 1 [10]), to verify if the one or more relations (see the set of system

compatibility rules including BSC and OCS in column 4 lines 36-42, figure 1 [10]) of the

relation path (see a unique path in column 14 lines 9-10) are in accordance with at least

one of the at least one specified relation type (see system and library calls in column 11

lines 23), and if said relation path (see a unique path in column 14 lines 9-10) exists and

if said one or more relations (see the set of system compatibility rules including BSC

and OCS in column 4 lines 36-42, figure 1 [10]) of the relation path (see a unique path

in column 14 lines 9-10) are in accordance, to apply the policy (see a set of rules

analyze the call based on the format of the application being analyzed; column 9 lines

4-11, figure 5) to the first object (see the object code of an application in figure 2 [18,

column 6 lines 15-21) for taking the policy decision (see analyzing and verifying in

column 11 lines 22-24, figure 7).

As to claim 8, Cline teaches the policy decision device (SBV program, see in

column 11 lines 22-24, figure 7) according to claim 7, wherein the at least one

propagation rule (see a set of rules analyze the call based on the format of the

application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5) specifies at least one

direction(see procedure calls in column 9 lines 15-19) and the processing unit (see the

block analyzer PROCBLK.C in column 10 lines 66-68, column 11 lines 1-2) is adapted

to verify if the one or more relations (see the set of system compatibility rules including

BSC and OCS in column 4 lines 36-42, figure 1 [10]) of the relation path (see a unique

path in column 14 lines 9-10) are in accordance with the at least one specified

direction(see procedure calls in column 9 lines 15-19) .

As to claim 9, Cline teaches The policy decision device (SBV program, see in

column 11 lines 22-24, figure 7) according to claim 7, wherein the at least one

propagation rule (see a set of rules analyze the call based on the format of the

application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5) specifies at least one

condition and the processing unit (see the block analyzer PROCBLK.C in column 10 lines 66-68, column 11 lines 1-2) is adapted to verify, for at least one of the objects (see the object code of an application in figure 2 [18, column 6 lines 15-21) of the relation path (see a unique path in column 14 lines 9-10), if said at least one object (see the object code of an application in figure 2 [18, column 6 lines 15-21) is in accordance with the at least one condition.

As to claim 10, Cline teaches the policy decision device (SBV program, see in column 11 lines 22-24, figure 7) according to claim 7, wherein the processing unit (see the block analyzer PROCBLK.C in column 10 lines 66-68, column 11 lines 1-2) is adapted to consider the existence of the relation path (see a unique path in column 14 lines 9-10) for the obtaining of the policy (see a set of rules analyze the call based on the format of the application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5).

As to claim 11, Cline teaches the policy decision device (SBV program, see in column 11 lines 22-24, figure 7) according to claim 7, wherein the processing unit (see the block analyzer PROCBLK.C in column 10 lines 66-68, column 11 lines 1-2) is adapted to obtain the at least one propagation rule (see a set of rules analyze the call based on the format of the application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5) from at least one propagation rule (see a set of rules analyze the call based on the format of the application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5) database on the basis of at least one reference identifier (see "open addressing" hash table in column 9

lines 15-19) associated to the at least one propagation rule (see a set of rules analyze

the call based on the format of the application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11,

figure 5) and the policy (see a set of rules analyze the call based on the format of the

application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5).

As to claim 12, Cline teaches the policy decision device (SBV program, see in

column 11 lines 22-24, figure 7) according to claim 7, wherein the processing unit (see

the block analyzer PROCBLK.C in column 10 lines 66-68, column 11 lines 1-2) is

adapted to obtain at least one further policy component (see a set of rules analyze the

call based on the format of the application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5)

of the policy (see a set of rules analyze the call based on the format of the application

being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5) from the at least one policy component

database (see a set of rules analyze the call based on the format of the application

being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5) based on at least one reference identifier

(see "open addressing" hash table in column 9 lines 15-19) associated to the at least

one further policy component (see a set of rules analyze the call based on the format of

the application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5) and the policy (see a set

of rules analyze the call based on the format of the application being analyzed; column

9 lines 4-11, figure 5).

As to claim 13, Cline teaches a computer program (see application program in

column 2 lines 58-61, column 3 lines 41-42) loadable into a policy decision device (SBV

program, see in column 11 lines 22-24, figure 7), the computer program (see application

program in column 2 lines 58-61, column 3 lines 41-42) comprising code adapted to

access objects (see the object code of an application in figure 2 [18, column 6 lines 15-

21) being relatable to each other by relations (see the set of system compatibility rules

including BSC and OCS in column 4 lines 36-42, figure 1 [10]) of one or more relation

types (see library calls in column 11 lines 23), to process a request (see basic blocks in

figure 7 [38]) for a policy decision (see analyzing and verifying in column 11 lines 22-24,

figure 7), the request (see basic blocks in figure 7 [38]) specifying a first object (see the

object code of an application in figure 2 [18, column 6 lines 15-21) of the objects (see

the object code of an application in figure 2 [18, column 6 lines 15-21) and request

information (see basic blocks in figure 7 [38]), to obtain a policy (see a set of rules

analyze the call based on the format of the application being analyzed; column 9 lines

4-11, figure 5) matching to the request information (see basic blocks in figure 7 [38])

and being applicable to a second object (see the object code of an application in figure

2 [18, column 6 lines 15-21) of the objects (see the object code of an application in

figure 2 [18, column 6 lines 15-21), to obtain at least one propagation rule (see a set of

rules analyze the call based on the format of the application being analyzed; column 9

lines 4-11, figure 5) associated to the policy (see a set of rules analyze the call based

on the format of the application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5), the at

least one propagation rule (see a set of rules analyze the call based on the format of the

application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5) specifying at least one relation

type (see system and library calls in column 11 lines 23) of the one or more relation

types ((see system and library calls in column 11 lines 23), to verify if a relation path

(see a unique path in column 14 lines 9-10) exits, the relation path (see a unique path in

column 14 lines 9-10) linking the first object (see the object code of an application in

figure 2 [18, column 6 lines 15-21) and the second object (see the object code of an

application in figure 2 [18, column 6 lines 15-21) and consisting of one or more of the

relations (see the set of system compatibility rules including BSC and OCS in column 4

lines 36-42, figure 1 [10]), to verify if the one or more relations (see the set of system

compatibility rules including BSC and OCS in column 4 lines 36-42, figure 1 [10]) of the

relation path (see a unique path in column 14 lines 9-10) are in accordance with at least

one of the at least one specified relation type (see system and library calls in column 11

lines 23), and if said relation path (see a unique path in column 14 lines 9-10) exists and

if said one or more relations (see the set of system compatibility rules including BSC

and OCS in column 4 lines 36-42, figure 1 [10]) of the relation path (see a unique path

in column 14 lines 9-10) are in accordance, to apply the policy (see a set of rules

analyze the call based on the format of the application being analyzed; column 9 lines

4-11, figure 5) to the first object (see the object code of an application in figure 2 [18,

column 6 lines 15-21) for taking the policy decision (see analyzing and verifying in

column 11 lines 22-24, figure 7).

        As to claim 14, Cline teaches the computer program (see application program in

column 2 lines 58-61, column 3 lines 41-42) according to claim 13, wherein the at least

one propagation rule (see a set of rules analyze the call based on the format of the

application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5) specifies at least one direction

(see procedure calls in column 9 lines 15-19) and the computer program (see

application program in column 2 lines 58-61, column 3 lines 41-42) comprises code (see

the object code of an application in figure 2 [18, column 6 lines 15-21) adapted to verify

if the one or more relations (see the set of system compatibility rules including BSC and

OCS in column 4 lines 36-42, figure 1 [10]) of the relation path (see a unique path in

column 14 lines 9-10) are in accordance with the at least one specified direction (see

procedure calls in column 9 lines 15-19).

As to claim 15, Cline teaches the computer program (see application program in

column 2 lines 58-61, column 3 lines 41-42) according to claim 13, wherein the at least

one propagation rule (see a set of rules analyze the call based on the format of the

application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5) specifies at least one

condition and the computer program (see application program in column 2 lines 58-61,

column 3 lines 41-42) comprises code (see the object code of an application in figure 2

[18, column 6 lines 15-21) adapted to verify for at least one of the objects (see the

object code of an application in figure 2 [18, column 6 lines 15-21) of the relation path

(see a unique path in column 14 lines 9-10) if said at least one object (see the object

code of an application in figure 2 [18, column 6 lines 15-21) is in accordance with the at

least one condition.

As to claim 16, Cline teaches the computer program (see application program in column 2 lines 58-61, column 3 lines 41-42) according to claim 13, wherein the computer program (see application program in column 2 lines 58-61, column 3 lines 41-42) comprises code (see the object code of an application in figure 2 [18, column 6 lines 15-21) adapted to consider the existence of the relation path (see a unique path in column 14 lines 9-10) for obtaining of the policy (see a set of rules analyze the call based on the format of the application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5).

As to claim 17, Cline teaches the computer program (see application program in column 2 lines 58-61, column 3 lines 41-42) according to claim 13, wherein the computer program (see application program in column 2 lines 58-61, column 3 lines 41-42) comprises code (see the object code of an application in figure 2 [18, column 6 lines 15-21) adapted to obtain the at least one propagation rule (see a set of rules analyze the call based on the format of the application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5) from at least one propagation rule database (see a set of rules analyze the call based on the format of the application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5) on the base of at least one reference identifier (see "open addressing" hash table in column 9 lines 15-19) associated to the at least one propagation rule (see a set of rules analyze the call based on the format of the application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5) and the policy (see a set of rules analyze the call based on the format of the application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5).

As to claim 18, Cline teaches the computer program (see application program in column 2 lines 58-61, column 3 lines 41-42) according to claim 13, wherein the computer program (see application program in column 2 lines 58-61, column 3 lines 41-42) comprises code (see the object code of an application in figure 2 [18, column 6 lines 15-21) adapted to obtain at least one further policy component (see a set of rules analyze the call based on the format of the application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5) of the policy (see a set of rules analyze the call based on the format of the application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5) from the at least one policy component database (see a set of rules analyze the call based on the format of the application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5) based on at least one reference identifier (see "open addressing" hash table in column 9 lines 15-19) associated to the at least one further policy component (see a set of rules analyze the call based on the format of the application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5) and the policy (see a set of rules analyze the call based on the format of the application being analyzed; column 9 lines 4-11, figure 5).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Schneier (US 5,850,516) is cited for the teaching of calculate the cost, time or probability of an attack to list the security assumptions of a system, to compare

competing systems, to evaluate system modifications, to perform security subsystem

analysis, and to allocate a security budget.

Reiter et al (US 6,049,872) is cited for the teaching of a Path Server for PGP, a

service for finding maximum sets of such paths to support authentication in PGP-based

applications.

Juttner et al (US 2002/0045453) is cited for the teaching of controlling the trade-

off between running time of the Lagrange algorithm and quality of the result.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to SUDHISH SURYAWANSI whose telephone number is

(571)270-7461. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 459.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Daniel Pan can be reached on 571-272-4172. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SUDHISH SURYAWANSI AU 4171

/Daniel Pan/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4171